

REMARKS

The applicant thanks the examiner for the telephone interview dated August 16, 2006, in which claims 1, 5, 7, 8, and 25-29, and the Godoy and Chakrabarti references were discussed.

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

Claim 35 recites the limitation "system" in line 1 of claim 35. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 35 has been amended.

5. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Godoy et al ("Godoy", "PersonalSearcher: An Intelligent Agent for Searching Web Pages"). As per claim 25, Godoy teaches a method comprising: assigning an energy value to each category of hierarchy of categories of web pages (Page 5 lines 22-31), the energy value of a category representing a user's degree of interest in the category, the energy value of a category being increased when a user accesses web pages belonging to that category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

Godoy does not disclose and would not have suggested adjusting the hierarchy of categories based on the energy values of each of the categories, as recited in amended claim 25.

Godoy discloses adding or decreasing weights of words in the subject definitions of categories depending on whether the words are found in the new cases added to the categories (page 5, lines 22-28). If the examiner contends that the "weights of words" in Godoy correspond to the "energy value" of claim 25, then Godoy does not disclose or suggest adjusting the hierarchy of categories based on the weights of words of each of the categories.

As per claim 26, Godoy teaches a method further comprising adjusting the hierarchy of categories based on the energy value of each of the categories, including splitting off a child category from a parent category in the hierarchy if the energy value of the parent category is above a pre-determined threshold, indicating that the user's interest in the parent category is above a certain threshold (Godoy, Page 5 lines 1-10).

Godoy does not disclose and would not have suggested splitting off a child category from a parent category in the hierarchy if the energy value of the parent category is above a pre-determined threshold, indicating that the user's interest in the parent category is above a certain threshold, as recited in claim 26.

Rather, Godoy discloses generating new groups for cases that do not belong to existing groups. For example, Godoy discloses "a case that does not surpass the thresholds for software agents and world wide web classifiers is grouped into the group of cases identified with the code 45 (if it is similar to them) or a new group is created at this level" (page 5, lines 1-10).

As per claim 27, Godoy teaches a method in which adjusting the hierarchy of categories includes removing a child category from the hierarchy if the energy value of the child category is below a predetermined threshold, indicating that the user's interest in the child category is below a certain threshold (Godoy, Page 6 lines 14-29).

Godoy does not disclose and would not have suggested removing a child category from the hierarchy if the energy value of the child category is below a pre-determined threshold, as recited in claim 27.

Rather, Godoy discloses discarding documents that do not have features belonging to any of the categories the user is interested in (col. 6, lines 14-29). Claim 27 is about removing a category, while Godoy discloses discarding documents.

7. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-14, 17, 18, 20, 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godoy et al ("Godoy", "PersonalSearcher: An Intelligent Agent for Searching Web Pages") in view of Chen et al ("Chen", "WebMate: A Personal Agent for Browsing and Searching") in view of Chakrabarti et al ("Chakrabarti", US 6,356,899). As per independent claim 1, Godoy discloses a system for managing a personal view for a user comprising: a personal view constructor, which builds the personal view as a hierarchy of categories based on the topic page extracted by the proxy (Page 3 lines 17-21); and a personal view maintainer, which adjusts the hierarchy according to an energy value of each of the categories (Page 5 lines 22-31). However, Godoy does not explicitly disclose a proxy. Chen teaches a proxy, which tracks web pages that have been accessed by the user and extracts a topic page from the web pages (Column 3 lines 30-37). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the proxy for extracting web topics of Chen with the system of Godoy. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way to more accurately monitor a user's actions. The modified Godoy fails to distinctly point out predefined categories. However, Chakrabarti teaches the categories in the personal view being selected from a group of predefined categories (Column 15 lines 1-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the predefined categories of Chakrabarti with the system of the modified Godoy. Motivation to do so would have been to avoid difficulties for the user in the form of retrieval and organization problems by using a familiar data structure.

Godoy, Chen, and Chakrabarti would not have made obvious a personal view constructor to build a personal view as a hierarchy of categories, the categories in the personal view being

selected from a group of predefined categories, as recited in claim 1. The examiner acknowledges that Godoy and Chen do not disclose such limitations, but points to Chakrabarti as disclosing what is missing in Godoy and Chen. The applicant disagrees.

Chakrabarti discloses a tool to enable a user to interactively create and/or modify an information database having a hierarchical, frame-based organizational structure (col. 5, lines 59-63). Chakrabarti discloses that the user can readily undertake interactive modification of the hierarchical structure (col. 15, lines 36-39). While Chakrabarti discloses that the user can add or remove frames from the structure, Chakrabarti does not disclose and would not have suggested that the frames be selected from a group of predefined frames when building the hierarchical structure.

Claim 11 is patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

8. Claims 5, 6, 9, 15, 16, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godoy et al ("Godoy", "PersonalSearcher: An Intelligent Agent for Searching Web Pages") and Chen et al ("Chen", "WebMate: A Personal Agent for Browsing and Searching") and Chakrabarti et al ("Chakrabarti", US 6,356,899) in view of Devaney et al ("Devaney", "Dynamically Adjusting Concepts to Accommodate Changing Contexts").
As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti fails to disclose a split operator for hierarchical nodes. However, Devaney discloses a method wherein the personal view maintainer splits off a child category from a parent category in the hierarchy if the energy value of the parent category is above a predetermined threshold (Column 7 lines 36-47). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the split operator of Devaney with the system of Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti. Motivation to do so would have been to reorganize the hierarchy to maximize category utility within the search space.

Godoy, Chen, Chakrabarti, and Devaney do not disclose and would not have made obvious that a personal view maintainer splits off a child category from a parent category in the hierarchy if the energy value of the parent category is above a pre-determined threshold, as recited in claim 5. The examiner acknowledges that Godoy, Chen, and Chakrabarti do not disclose these limitations, but points to Devaney as disclosing what is lacking in Godoy, Chen, and Chakrabarti. The applicant disagrees.

Devaney discloses determining, for each node of a partition, whether splitting off the node would result in an increase in the category utility of the partition, and splitting off the node that results in the largest increase in the category utility. (col. 7, lines 43-44) Thus, Devaney teaches splitting off a node in order to increase a category utility, not splitting off a child

category from a parent category if the energy value of the parent category is above a pre-determined threshold, as recited in claim 5.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

The limitation added to claim 25 was previously included in claim 26, thus the claim amendments would not require a new search.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/17/2006

Rex I. Huang
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906